

The FCC would do well to keep net neutrality laws protected. The so-called “freedom” proposed does not protect the public; in fact, it exposes them to the unnecessary marketing ploys and prioritization that would undoubtedly be employed by larger corporations. What has been proposed, the revoking of net neutrality, will expose the public to unfair and unjust business conduct including the prioritization of internet speeds, regulation of free speech, and even debilitate small businesses that have depended on net neutrality since its introduction. Net neutrality was put in place for a reason, and for those reasons it should be kept. The antitrust law is similar to net neutrality law because it protected the consumer. By revoking net neutrality it would prove hypocritical by the ethics put in place by the United States previously. Net neutrality has been wholly beneficial thus far; so for what reason must it be changed? There is a difference between greed and good commerce. Greed can be considered when more is taken than what was given; opening a resource to corporate regulation after it was owned by all, without their consent, is a display of greed from which no good commerce will arise. Revoking net neutrality will only lead to negative impacts further along. I might also add that while many of the comments against the removal of net neutrality could have been produced by untruthful means; it is the ones in favor of this proposition that are the least original, underhanded, and have underwhelming support. I’m not a statistician, but if there is this much overwhelming support for the protection of net neutrality then it should outweigh any degree of bias one may propose. The public at large clearly isn’t in support of the decision to end net neutrality. I would bet my life on it.